Ham-Digital Digest   Wed, 26 Oct 94   Volume 94 : Issue 354

Today's Topics:
                      Basic Question. (2 msgs)
            Ham-Digital Digest V94 ?353 - HF Packet QRG's
                  Interest in KaGold mailing List?
            NoCal OO goes after Packet BULLetins (2 msgs)
TNC-2 streamswitch vs. type-in flow control bug confirmed & work around
                    using passwords over packet
                       What is 'ampr.org'?

We trust that readers are intelligent enough to realize that all text
herein consists of personal comments and does not represent the official
policies or positions of any party. Your mileage may vary. So there.

Date: Tue, 25 Oct 1994 15:03:13 GMT
From: gary@ke4zv.atl.ga.us (Gary Coffman)
Subject: Basic Question.

In article <38hi0l$k6u@newsserver.trl.OZ.AU> handers@newsserver.trl.oz.au (Howard
Anders) writes:
>I have never tried any digital modes B4 & would like to try "good ole RTTY"
>i.e. just plain, ordinary, vanilla, RTTY.
>Would appreciate suggestions as to a relatively inexpensive way of
>getting it going & trying it, without buying a $3000 computer.
>(Electronically that is, I don't really want to use an old teletype
>machine.)
>This is assuming that there are people using "plain ole RTTY" on the
>bands to talk to??!! Where is the bulk of activity? Tks.
>Howard Anders VK3AYV

All you need is a TU (Terminal Unit, the RTTY name for a plain dumb
modem), and some machine that speaks Baudot. Today that usually is
a computer of some sort, though a mechanical teletype also works of
course. The computer need not cost $3000, but it does need a keyboard
and a screen, and software to decode/encode Baudot to video characters
and from keystrokes. Something as simple and obsolete as a Commodore
C64 will suffice.

Gary
--
Gary Coffman KE4ZV | You make it, | gatech!wa4mei!ke4zv!gary
Destructive Testing Systems | we break it. | emory!kd4nc!ke4zv!gary
534 Shannon Way | Guaranteed! | gary@ke4zv.atl.ga.us
Lawrenceville, GA 30244 | |

Date: 25 Oct 1994 17:33:22 GMT
From: moritz@ipers1.e-technik.uni-stuttgart.de ()
Subject: Basic Question.

>Would appreciate suggestions as to a relatively inexpensive way of
>getting it going & trying it, without buying a $3000 computer.

Best will be to get a s/h AT or so and use a PD RTTY program.
Some people, at least here give AT's away for around 100$ or even
for free.

There used to be hardware solutions around, but building one or those
will certainly be more expensive, and then you stil need a keyboard
abd a display.

73, Moritz DL5UH

Date: 26 Oct 94 08:21:05 GMT
From: heis1633@mailszrz.zrz.tu-berlin.d400.DE ((Wolfgang Heise))
Subject: Ham-Digital Digest V94 ?353 - HF Packet QRG's

>From: Steven Skorka <74250.1461@CompuServe.COM>
>Subject: Where Are HF Packet BBS's?

>I have a friend in North Carolina who is an Advanced ham. He
>would like to try packet via HF rather than VHF. Are there any
>HF packet BBS's out there on HF reachable from the southeast?

Hi,

I would be interested in getting such an info too. If there is someone who
will answer to Stevens question please drop the msg to my personal adress as
well.

Tnx es vy 73 de Wolfgang (dl7vwh)

Wolfgang Heise - VOICE: ##49-30-31425672 - FAX: ..-31426797
Technische Universitaet Berlin   :-%
Institut fuer Bergbauwissenschaften, Sekr. BH 3   :/i
Str. des 17. Juni 135, 10623 Berlin, Germany ||*(
possible on hamradio/packetradio too by DL7VWH@db0gr.bln.deu.eu

----

Date: Mon, 24 Oct 94 19:51:02 MST
From: david@stat.com (David Dodell)
Subject: Interest in KaGold mailing List?

I am interested in starting a Kagold mailing list to exchange hints,
files etc.

I can maintain the mailing list on my site, but before I do so, I would
like to see if there is an interest.

David WB7TPY

Editor, HICNet Medical Newsletter
Internet: david@stat.com   FAX: +1 (602) 451-1165
Bitnet : ATW1H@ASUACAD

Date: Tue, 25 Oct 1994 14:16:42 GMT
From: sww@csuohio.edu (Steve Wolf)
Subject: NoCal OO goes after Packet BULLetins

pouelle@uoft02.utoledo.edu wrote:
:
: Extending this line of thought, and twisting it ever so slightly:
: If a packet bulletin addressed to CHESS is not amateur related since it gives me
: (an amateur radio operator) information from the author (another amateur - his
: call is in the header info) about a mutual interest is considered a bulletin
: since it is effectively addressed to all amateurs interested in CHESS and hence
: a one way communication, all that has to happen if for the originating station
: to receive one reply to the message to make it a two way (read non-broadcast)
: exchange! If this is not correct, the next thing to be "attacked" in this
: manner will be the net control operators starting the net. I have addressed

: messages to groups like HARDWARE and received a number of replies - as far as
: I'm concerned this is just another way to initiate the exchange of
: information between two (or more) stations and therefore allowed under Part 97.
:

A "CQ" is indeed defined as a one-way transmission in 97.111. It is allowed.
Appending a "CQ" to a signature file would be an obvious attempt to get
around the content being a bulletin.

73,
Steve
      Internet: no8m@hamnet.wariat.org
      Packet : no8m@no8m.#neoh.oh.usa.na

Date: Tue, 25 Oct 1994 14:56:52 GMT
From: gary@ke4zv.atl.ga.us (Gary Coffman)
Subject: NoCal OO goes after Packet BULLetins

In article <1994Oct24.205835.11821@news.csuohio.edu> sww@csuohio.edu (Steve Wolf)
writes:
>
>The point is being missed. Are packet bulletins addressed to either
>"all" or a like form of "all" (MUSIC, SEWING, CRAFTS, NAFTA, etc.)
>indeed informational bulletins?
>
>Is there a difference between:
>
>1. My tuning in a W1AW transmission and listening to an ARRL bulletin.
>2. My tuning in a packet BBS station and reading an ARRL bulletin.
>
>I submit that both forms of the bulletin are the same. I end up with
>identical information. In both cases, the bulletin is an
>"informational bulletin". In both cases, the transmission is
>one-way. There is not an exchange between two stations. The form
>that the data takes is irrelevant. The mode upon which the data is
>transferred is again irrelevant.

I disagree. You have to do more than "tune in" to a packet BBS. You
have to establish a two way connection and *request* the information.
It's third party traffic pure and simple. Two amateur stations are
participating in information exchange.

>Then, what is the difference between:
>
>1. My tuning in a packet BBS and reading an ARRL bulletin.
>2. My tuning in a packet BBS and reading a bulletin about cooking.

>
>I again submit that both forms of bulletin are identical. Even a
>request (buried in the recipe) from a cook for more cooks to respond
>is nothing but a "CQ" and, again, a one-way flow of information.

Again, you do more than "tune in", you must *request* the
information. Unlike broadcast, you are an active participant
in the process. A CQ is not a true one way transmission. It
is an intergal part of establishing a two way exchange of
information. It's a solicitation for a response.

>If there is no difference, could W1AW begin harassing Clinton about
>his viewpoints on foreign trade (in their bulletins)? Could they
>discuss cooking or sewing? We must agree that the rules would
>prohibit such bulletins.

Yes, because they are true broadcasts. Anyone passively listening
gets them. Packet bulletins are fundamentally different in that
active participation is required.

>Because we use error correction causing a "connect" to be required does
>not change the fact that a packet radio bulletin is a one way transmission.
>It is not addressed to a ham. It is addressed to the ham community,
>to the general public, just like the W1AW bulletins. The changing of
>the definition of a "bulletin" due to the medium upon which it is
>transferred is not proper.

If you take this line, then you must squelch all roundtable and net
operations. Just like the packet bulletin, each station makes statements
to the participants and awaits responses from whomever is interested
in the topic. Packet bulletins are no different except that they are
not conducted in realtime. They are simply the packet version of the
roundtable or net. If the topic of disscussion is allowable on a net
or roundtable, it's also appropriate for packet bulletins.

Bulletin is misleading terminology in this respect. The destination
address header should instead be considered as a special interest
group address, or as we call it here in netnews, a newsgroup. In
other amateur use, we'd call it a net or roundtable. The key is that
people have to "check in" to participate, on packet or on a voice
net. It's not primarily a passive activity like listening to W1AW.
With W1AW all you *can* do is listen, because they don't monitor
the frequencies on which they broadcast.

Gary
--
Gary Coffman KE4ZV | You make it, | gatech!wa4mei!ke4zv!gary
Destructive Testing Systems | we break it. | emory!kd4nc!ke4zv!gary

```
534 Shannon Way          |    Guaranteed!      | gary@ke4zv.atl.ga.us
Lawrenceville, GA 30244   |                     |
```

Date: 27 Oct 94 04:21:55 GMT
From: imotion@iu.NET (Howard Goldstein)
Subject: TNC-2 streamswitch vs. type-in flow control bug confirmed & work around

>The problem is this: sending the STREAMSW
>character followed by a stream letter and nothing else temporarily
>locks up the serial flow from the TNC to the computer. I was able
[stuff omitted]
>If so you have the lock-up as well.
>Does anyone have the source for TNC2 firmware that can find this
>"feature"?

Congratulations Byon, you're the first to report this one! Unfortunately
1.1.9 is in beta test as we speak; I'd not put too much hope in seeing the
fix make it in the official 1.1.9.

****
WORK-AROUND:

An anamolous lockup condition will occur when the TNC is issued consecutive
streamswitches lacking one or more intervening SENDPAC (or other type-in
flow control-resetting) characters. This lockup can be worked-around by
setting FLOW to OFF.
****

Please let us know whether PaKet requires type-in flow control.

On your question, I'd very much like to hear from others who have source.

73, N2WX
Author, TAPR TNC-2 firmware
--   --
Howard Goldstein   imotion@iu.net
InfoMotion, Inc.   CIS:75006,702

Date: Tue, 25 Oct 1994 14:08:43 GMT
From: mack@ncifcrf.gov (Joe Mack)
Subject: using passwords over packet

In article <Cy8B7q.1o8@scr.siemens.com> dep@scr.siemens.com (David Post) writes:
>In <38he1p$iba@gboro.rowan.edu> CASSIDY@saturn.rowan.edu (Kyle Cassidy) writes:

```
>
>>i'm considering setting up a packet/internet gateway at my site, but i'm
>>concerned by the apparant lack of security. (i.e. if a user wants to read his
>>mail over the airwaves where anybody is listening, i don't have a problem with
>>that, but i don't want anybody who is listening to then be able to log on as
>>that user....) what i would like to know is:
>
>>   1) is there a way to use non-echoed passwords over packet?
>
     A similar problem exist with people logging on over nets. Passwords
etc are shipped 1000's of miles and anyone monitoring the packets and addresses
of these packets can pick up the response to the "password:" prompt. This
has all been handled, although I don't know how. MIT has a process called
something like CEREBOS (it's that name of the dog that guards hell in
greek mythology) which handles the password bit. Go ask your unix guru.

     Joe Mack NA3T


------------------------------

Date: Tue, 25 Oct 1994 14:33:26 GMT
From: gary@ke4zv.atl.ga.us (Gary Coffman)
Subject: What is 'ampr.org'?

In article <Cy64y6.4Gs@baan.nl> feicodb@aar.baan.nl (Feico de Boer) writes:
>A few questions:
>
>1) Being a newby I've heard some thing about 'ampr.org'. I think I know what
>it is but can somebody tell me more about it.

ampr.org is the internet domain for amateur radio TCP/IP. It's 44.xx.xx.xx.

>2) I would like to go into packet radio but HAM tranceivers are quite
>expensive. Therefore I would like to modify an old 27Mc tranceiver for
>use with packet radio simply by putting a 27Mc <> 144Mc transverter after
>it.
>
>This can be done ofcourse, but since the CB set has a fairly small IF
>I was wondering wich speeds can be achieved with such a setup.

Assuming this is a European FM CB, 1200 baud is sure, 2400 baud is
likely, and 9600 baud will require modifications to the set. If it's
an AM CB like we are blessed with in the States, then it won't interoperate
with other amateur signals without first modifying it to FM. There are
kits available to do that for the more popular board sets such as those
used in Midland radios.

Gary
```

```
--
Gary Coffman KE4ZV          |    You make it,    | gatech!wa4mei!ke4zv!gary
Destructive Testing Systems |    we break it.    | emory!kd4nc!ke4zv!gary
534 Shannon Way             |    Guaranteed!     | gary@ke4zv.atl.ga.us
Lawrenceville, GA 30244     |                    |
```

Date: Tue, 25 Oct 1994 15:29:53 GMT
From: dbushong@wang.com (Dave Bushong)

References<kevin.jessup.51.002D3402@mail.mei.com>
<FiHNuc4w165w@lmr.mv.com>,<Cy6MMI.B56@wang.com>, <Cy7MvK.Gsx@utnetw.utoledo.edu>
Subject: Re: NoCal OO goes after Packet BULLetins

pouelle@uoft02.utoledo.edu writes:

>So you wouldn't be upset if I were to dedicate a packet BBS just to
>posting cookie recipes? How about developing packet news groups?
>Then the only poeple who would see the latest and by far tastiest
>cookie recipe would be amateurs who wanted it. Oh, I forgot - you
>can do that now, just ignore the posts to cookie, recipe, ect. Maybe
>we should get the ARRL to propose to the FCC what topics are to be
>talked about on each frequency for each band.

I don't think that would be a good idea. I think you should be able
to talk about whatever you feel like talking about. The same is true
for packet, or any other mode. It's just that indiscriminately
posting bulletins to every PBBS in the country about things that are
not of interest to the general ham population is a waste of resources
and annoying. Depending on the interpretation of 97.113(b), it might
also be illegal.

Dave, KZ1O

--
Dave Bushong
OPEN/image Recognition Products

End of Ham-Digital Digest V94 #354
****